

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed on May 14, 2007, the Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101; rejected claims 1-8, 10, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Chase, Jr. et al.* (Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0187801); rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chase, Jr. et al.* in view of *Olsen et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,069); and rejected claims 11 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chase, Jr. et al.* in view of *Takamizawa et al.* (Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0049378); and objected to claims 12 and 13 for depending from a rejected base claim, but otherwise containing allowable subject matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 12 and 13. Applicants have amended claims 1-7, 9, 11, 13, 18, and 19 and cancelled claims 10, 12, and 20-38. Claims 1-9, 11, and 13-19 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to a non-statutory subject matter. With this response, Applicants have amended claim 19 to recite a "recording medium storing a program to cause an information-processing apparatus to perform a method." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 101 rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), because the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to teach all the recitations of the claims. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 18, and 19, to include subject matter

from claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 18, and 19 are allowable over the cited prior art of record. Dependent claims 2-9, 11, and 13-17 are also allowable at least for the reasons set forth above in connection with independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

The preceding arguments are based on the arguments presented in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The pending claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge  
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.



Dated: August 13, 2007

By: Reg. No. 33,921

Arthur A. Smith



Reg. No. 56,877

/direct telephone: (202) 408-4049/